

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are now pending in the application and stand rejected. On December 20, 2005 Applicant's attorney Elizabeth D. Odell and Examiner Y. Lee spoke by telephone regarding the Examiner's rejections of the claims and objections to the drawings. Applicant's attorney thanks the Examiner for his time and courtesy. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections and objections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the attached replacement sheet of drawings, legends have been added to Figure 1 to indicate the system 10, aircraft 12, electronic subsystem 14, and cameras 16 and 18 described in the specification.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Anthony et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,559,769). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that in the Response to Arguments, the Examiner has mischaracterized Applicant's arguments filed October 17, 2005. Applicant states that Anthony et al. fails to disclose using an in-flight telephone system previously provided for use in an aircraft. Embodiments of the system of Anthony et al. may be configured with wireless modems 310 and 320 for cellular and satellite transmission

(FIG. 5). Such transmissions, however, may or may not be feasible or allowed from an aircraft during flight, in view of possible interference, e.g., with aircraft cockpit signals. In contrast, an existing in-flight telephone system for transmitting voice signals from an aircraft, as known in the art, is specifically configured to avoid interference with other aircraft signals. In various implementations of the invention as claimed, an existing in-flight telephone system can be used for transmitting essentially real-time video signals from an aircraft. Such use of an existing in-flight telephone system is novel and not anticipated by Anthony et al.

In contrast to the system of Anthony et al., one configuration of the system recited in amended claim 1 can easily be retrofitted to existing aircraft, without the need for satellite transponders or other expensive systems (specification, paragraphs 2 and 24). Applicant submits that claim 1 should be allowed.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1. Applicant submits that claims 2-7, when considered together with the recitations of claim 1, also should be allowed.

Referring to independent claim 8, Anthony et al. do not describe a modem operatively connected between a processor and an existing in-flight telephone system on an aircraft. Applicant submits that claim 8 should be allowed.

Claims 9-14 depend from claim 8. Applicant submits that claims 9-14, when considered together with the recitations of claim 8, also should be allowed.

Referring to independent claim 15, Anthony et al. do not describe an existing in-flight telephone system on an aircraft to which a visual monitoring system is retrofitted, wherein the in-flight telephone system transmits a video data stream output to a ground station. Applicant submits that claim 15 should be allowed.

Claims 16-19 depend from claim 15. Applicant submits that claims 16-19, when considered together with the recitations of claim 15, also should be allowed.

Referring to independent claim 20, the claim is amended to recite a method for visually monitoring a predetermined location within an aircraft. The amendment of claim 20 does not introduce any new matter and thus does not require any additional searching. Anthony et al. do not describe using an electronics subassembly to convert a streaming video signal into a format suitable for transmission over an existing telephone system of the aircraft. Applicant submits that claim 20 as amended should be allowed. Claims 21-23 depend from claim 20. Applicant submits that claims 21-23, when considered together with the recitations of claim 20, also should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (314)-726-7521.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 10, 2006

By:


Elizabeth D. Odell, No. 39,532

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
7700 Bonhomme, Suite 400
St. Louis, Missouri 63105

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached replacement sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 1. The attached replacement sheet, which includes Figures 1 and 3, replaces the original sheet including Figures 1 and 3.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet